STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

UNPUBLISHED June 12, 1998

Plaintiff-Appellee,

 \mathbf{V}

No. 199512 Washtenaw Circuit Court LC No. 96-005623 FH

KEI-CHI CHANG,

Defendant-Appellant.

Before: Wahls, P.J., and Jansen and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant pleaded nolo contendere to receiving and concealing stolen property over \$100, MCL 750.535; MSA 28.803, and received a sentence of five years' probation. Defendant appeals by leave granted. We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court correctly denied defendant's motion to suppress evidence seized from his apartment during the execution of two search warrants. Assuming without deciding that the law enforcement agencies executing the warrants were acting outside their bailiwick, violations of jurisdictional statutes do not give rise to applications of the exclusionary rule. *People v McCrady*, 213 Mich App 474, 480-481; 540 NW2d 718 (1995); *People v Clark*, 181 Mich App 577, 579-582; 450 NW2d 75 (1989).

The trial court also correctly rejected defendant's challenge to the sufficiency of the affidavit underlying the first search warrant. Based on the information set forth in the affidavit, we find that a reasonably cautious person could find a substantial basis to conclude that the items sought in the affidavit would be found in defendant's residence, and that the items constituted evidence of the stalking. *People v Sloan*, 450 Mich 160, 167-169; 538 NW2d 380 (1995); *People v Chandler*, 211 Mich App 604, 612; 536 NW2d 799 (1995); *People v Dowdy*, 211 Mich App 562, 567; 536 NW2d 794 (1995); *People v Lucas*, 188 Mich App 554, 567-568;470 NW2d 460 (1991). Moreover, because the first warrant was valid, the second warrant was also valid.

Affirmed.

- /s/ Myron H. Wahls
- /s/ Kathleen Jansen
- /s/ Hilda R. Gage